

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

ONTARIO A. DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

10-cv-674-slc

BARBARA DELAP, SGT. NOVINSKA,
NURSE JANE DOE and
PETER HUIBREGTSE,

Defendants.

On July 1, 2011, I denied plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction without prejudice to his refileing the motion following the court's procedures on filing motions for preliminary injunction. Now before the court is plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of that order, dkt. 31, in which he requests that the court rely on his original submission rather than having him file a new one.

In his motion, plaintiff says that he is missing page two of the *Procedure To Be Followed On Motions For Injunctive Relief* that the court sent him with the July 1, 2011 order. Enclosed with this order is a complete copy of the procedure. In his motion, plaintiff also says that the instructions are confusing in that he had already included a statement of facts in his original motion. So that plaintiff is aware, the court will not consider facts contained only in a brief. Instead, plaintiff's proposed findings of fact must be in a separate document. Further, each proposed fact must be in a separate numbered paragraph and each factual proposition must be followed by a reference to evidence supporting the proposed fact. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration will be denied. Plaintiff is reminded that he may refile his motion for injunctive relief in accordance with the attached procedures.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Ontario Davis's motion for reconsideration, dkt. 31, is DENIED.

Entered this 26nd day of July, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge